

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/731,882	12/09/2003	James Rohl	279.630US1	6739	
21186 SCHWEGMA	7590 06/18/200 N, LUNDBERG & WC	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 2938			NGUYEN, PHONG H		
MINNEAPOL	IS, MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3724	•	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/18/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com scape@slwip.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/731,882	ROHL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
PHONG H. NGUYEN	3724		

	PHONG H. NGUYEN	3724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 04 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.				
 All The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	vhich places the r (3) a Request			
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A 		in the final rejection whi	ahawar ia latar In			
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.			
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropriat	e extension fee			
have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t They raise new issues that would require further cor They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause			
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>10-12.57 and 64-66</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>53-56 and 58-63</u> .						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowan	ce because:			
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other: 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
13. [] Outer						
	/Phong H Nguyen/ Examiner, Art Unit 3724 June 15, 2009					

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that the combination of Tsubota and Lyon does not teach the limitation of the lubricant being directed so as to be concentrated at the view of the continuation of the concentration of the concentration of the concentration of the concentration of the same concentration (amount per area) as the short groove. This argument is not persuasive. As shown in Fig. 7A and described in page 8, lines 3-10 of the Specification, the term "concentrate" means the gathering of lubricant in quantity at area 710 but not the amount per area as asserted by the Applicant. The Applicant does not explain why there is a difference between, for example, 1 inch square area of the L-shaped groove 710 in Fig. 7A and 1 inch square area of the I-shaped groove of a side of a rectangle. In both cases, the area is 1 inch

While the structure of groove in the claimed invention and the combination of Tsubota and Lyon is different, it is not clearly claimed. The functional of area 710 in Fig. 7A is claimed instead. The groove in the combination of Tsubota and Lyon meets the functional language of the area 7(0) therefore, the combination of Tsubota and Lyon reads on claims 10 and 65.